

NOV 3 1941

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

VOL. 35, NO. 4

October 27, 1941

WHOLE NO. 930

PERIODICAL ROOM  
GENERAL LIBRARY  
UNIV. OF MICHIGAN  
**MEDIZING ATHENIAN ARISTOCRATS (Robinson)**

## REVIEWS

CHAMBERLAIN, Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament (*Carroll*) ; LIVINGSTONE, Plato (*Houghton*) ; KERÉNYI, JUNG, Das göttliche Kind in mythologischer und psychologischer Beleuchtung (*Riess*) ; WADDELL, Manetho. ROBBINS, Ptolemy, Tetrabiblos (*McCracken*) ; DYROFF, Peripatos über das Greisenalter (*Plumpe*)

## ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

## TWO BOOKS TO REMEMBER

### The Roman's World

by Frank Gardner Moore

"Very useful and well-arranged book." — Classical Weekly. \$3.75, illus.

### Greek Life and Thought

by La Rue Van Hook

"The best treatise dealing with the field chosen." — Classical Weekly. \$2.50, illus.

Write for full information

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS  
Morningside Heights - New York

# CLASSICAL WEEKLY

Published weekly (each Monday) except in weeks in which there is an academic vacation or Armistice Day, Thanksgiving Day, Christmas, New Year's Day, Washington's Birthday, Easter, or Memorial Day. A volume contains approximately twenty-five issues. Owner and Publisher: The Classical Association of the Atlantic States. Place of Publication: University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania. Printed by The Beaver Printing Company, Greenville, Pennsylvania.

James Stinchcomb, Editor; Jotham Johnson, Associate Editor, University of Pittsburgh, 4200 Fifth Avenue, Pittsburgh, Penna. John F. Gummere, Secretary and Treasurer, 418 South Wycombe Avenue, Lansdowne, Pennsylvania.

Contributing Editors: Lionel Casson, Eugene W. Miller, Charles T. Murphy, Bluma L. Trell, Edna White.

Price, \$2.00 per volume in the Western Hemisphere; elsewhere \$2.50. All subscriptions run by the volume. Single numbers: to subscribers 15 cents, to others 25 cents prepaid (otherwise 25 cents and 35 cents). If affidavit to invoice is required, sixty cents must be added to the subscription price.

Entered as second-class matter October 14, 1938, at the post office at Pittsburgh, Pa., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in the Act of February 28, 1925, authorized October 14, 1938.

Volume 35 contains issues dated: October 6, 13, 20, 27; November 3, 17; December 1, 8, 15 (1941); January 12, 19, 26; February 9, 16; March 2, 9, 16, 23; April 13, 20, 27; May 4, 11, 18; June 1 (1942).

## COMING ATTRACTIONS

### NOVEMBER 7 University of Pittsburgh

#### Dedication of Greek Room

Seminars in all departments of the University on the contribution of Greece to each field of learning

Members of the classical organizations are invited

### NOVEMBER 10 Seaside Hotel, Atlantic City

#### NEW JERSEY CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

12:30 P.M. Luncheon in conjunction with Association of Teachers of Modern Languages, Absecon Room

Speaker: Professor Roland Grubb Kent, University of Pennsylvania

Topic: The Importance of Linguistics as a Science to the Public in General

#### 2:40 P.M. Sun Room

Edmund C. Allen, Westfield High School, presiding

Lecturer: Henry T. Wilt, Westhampton Beach, Long Island

Topic: Classical Elements in the World of Tomorrow (illustrated)

Panel Discussion: Latin for Defense

### NOVEMBER 21 Hotel John Marshall, Richmond

#### CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF VIRGINIA

President: Professor A. D. Fraser, University of Virginia

#### 1 P. M. Luncheon Meeting

Awarding of Latin Tournament Prizes

#### 2 P. M. Papers

Professor John S. Kieffer, St. John's College (Methods of Instruction in the Classics at St. John's College)

Mrs. J. H. Tyree, Richmond (History of the Classical Association of Virginia)

Mrs. W. Alan Peery, Winchester High School (Steering the Latin Course between Scylla and Charybdis)

### NOVEMBER 22 Chalfonte Hotel, Atlantic City

#### CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION OF THE ATLANTIC STATES

President: Professor Moses Hadas, Columbia University

Vice-Presidents: Miss Edna White, Dickinson High School, Jersey City; Miss Juanita M. Downes, Cheltenham High School, Philadelphia

Secretary-Treasurer: Dr. John F. Gummere, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia

10:30 A.M. "Enrichment of Teacher and Student through the Classics"

Speakers:

Miss Mary L. Hess, Liberty High School, Bethlehem (Latin Tournaments—What? Why? When? Where? How?)

Professor Alice Parker Talmadge, Cedar Crest College (The Greek Drama on the College Campus)

Dr. John F. Gummere, William Penn Charter School, Philadelphia (Semantics in the Secondary School)

Miss Mary E. Van Divort, Senior High School, New Castle (What's in a Name?)

### DECEMBER 29-31 Hartford

#### AMERICAN PHILOLOGICAL ASSOCIATION

ARCHAEOLOGICAL INSTITUTE OF AMERICA

## MEDIZING ATHENIAN ARISTOCRATS

In the course of a recent paper<sup>1</sup> on party strife at Athens I maintained that the aristocrats were pro-Persian at a critical moment in their country's history, a point which Malcolm F. McGregor now denies.<sup>2</sup> It is important to discover the truth, not only for its own sake, but also from the point of view of the broad sweep of history, for it is a fact that as far as the other two international crises in ancient Greek history are concerned (the Macedonian and the Roman), it was the propertied classes who deserted democracy.

By way of background we may first call attention to Meritt's fundamental article<sup>3</sup> on a reconciliation between the tyrant Hippias and the Alcmaeonidae, a reconciliation that was only temporary, since the Alcmaeonidae ultimately banished tyranny from Athens. There followed immediately, however, the brief rule of the aristocrat Isagoras, who (to quote McGregor, 74) revised the citizenship rolls and struck off the lists "residents of metic and impure Athenian descent, who, with the poorer classes, had formed the bulk of Peisistratos' support." This policy reacted against Isagoras for, as McGregor remarks, the Alcmaeonid Cleisthenes "was astute enough to attach to himself the loyalty of this drifting popular element, to whom his new democratic programme most appealed." My own observation (232) was: "Let us remember, too, that the supporters of the Alcmaeonidae included not only the city population . . . but also the people of the Hills, former supporters of tyranny, but devoted to the Alcmaeonidae ever since Cleisthenes had restored to them the land taken by Isagoras."

This brings us to the critical years around 500 B.C. and to the point at issue, the attitude of the Athenian aristocrats toward Persia. In my paper (232) I argued that the vote on aid to the Asiatic Greeks at the time of the Ionian Revolt affords us the opportunity of identifying the pro-Persian faction at Athens. Since aid was voted and since the Alcmaeonidae were the leading group at Athens, it is sensible to think of them as determining the vote; we may recall, too, that the Alcmaeonidae had many supporters among the city population, not a few of whom had connections with Ionia, if they were not actually from there. The Athenians had every reason to fear Persia, which had already seized Sigeum, but the alarm of the Alcmaeonidae must

have been especially great, for the exiled tyrant Hippias was in the Persian Empire plotting an invasion of Greece. The triumph of Persia, first in Ionia and then in Greece, would mean the end of the Alcmaeonidae. There was not room in Athens for them and Hippias. The Alcmaeonidae, then, were anti-Persian, as McGregor also concludes (88), though it is the exact opposite of the opinion reached by Walker (Cambridge Ancient History 4.169).

But this leaves us the aristocrats as the pro-Persian faction at Athens, a point denied by both Walker (169) and McGregor (92). The latter mentions the well-known friendship of the Athenian aristocrats for Sparta and claims that they were also anti-Persian, referring to their policy on tyranny and Persia from 560 B.C. to the days of the Philaid Cimon in the fifth century. We must make certain, however, that political expediency did not, for the moment under discussion, drive tyrannists and aristocrats into a coalition which was pro-Spartan and, as a consequence, pro-Persian. We may, with McGregor, not wish to believe Aristotle that the aristocrats in the days before Cleisthenes were friends of the tyrants (though many of them had prospered under the Peisistratidae), but after Isagoras' revision of the rolls and after Cleisthenes' reforms, to whom else in Athens could the aristocrats appeal for help? The tyrannists, having lost their "popular support," would welcome this aid in their struggle against the democratic masses; incidentally, when we speak of tyrannists, it is essential to differentiate between leaders and supporters (90). McGregor also argues (77) that "Sparta's lack of success on behalf of her natural allies, Isagoras and the conservatives, had been and continued to be a blow to Spartan prestige . . . Sparta now resorted to more desperate measures and proposed to the delegates gathered at Sparta in 504 B.C. the restoration of Hippias." If the aristocrats were the friends of Sparta, and if Sparta proposed the restoration of the exile Hippias (as Persia herself wished), does it not follow that the Athenian aristocrats were temporarily forced to be pro-tyrannist and so must be called pro-Persian? (McGregor's reasoning at another place [72] was that the Alcmaeonidae were "hostile to the tyrants and so must be called anti-Persian.")

Pro-Persian factions at Athens were neither sustained nor important; indeed, as already intimated, McGregor says (93) that no pro-Persian faction existed after 510 B.C. My own observation (234-5), in connection with the prosecution of Miltiades, was: "The various appeals were addressed to the masses, the aristocrats being ignored . . . Foreign crises might come and go, but the struggle for power at Athens seemed destined to be fought out within the various factions of the masses."

Finally we must notice the rise of Themistocles.

<sup>1</sup> "The Struggle for Power at Athens in the Early Fifth Century," *AJPh* 60 (1939) 232-7

<sup>2</sup> "The Pro-Persian Party at Athens from 510 to 480 B.C.," *Athenian Studies Presented to William Scott Ferguson*, Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Supplementary Volume 1.71-95. Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1940

<sup>3</sup> *Hesperia* 8 (1939) 59-65. This is accepted by McGregor (73) and by me (*Hellenic History*, 1939, 80). I follow McGregor in using the term 'aristocrats' to denote 'the conservative or oligarchical nobles, as opposed to the liberal, though by birth aristocratic, Alkmaionidae.'

Walker (170) says that Cleisthenes' Medizing had probably cost his party the support of the city population. McGregor, however, is quite correct when he suggests (85) that "just as the Alkmaionidai had once appealed to the previous admirers of the tyrants, so now Themistokles outbid the Alkmaionidai for the support of the same popular element. My own observation (233) was: 'It does not take much argument to show that the masses, once started on the road of radicalism, will quickly abandon their old leader in favor of a new and more radical one.'

McGregor goes on to explain (94) that "strange political alliance" between the Philaid Miltiades and Themistocles at the time of Miltiades' prosecution by the Alcmaeonidae. (Incidentally, it is hard to imagine Themistocles, the radical, coming to the support of Miltiades, the leader of the aristocrats [79, n. 7, 91]. This unnatural alliance would be impossible, with the aristocrats pro-Persian; besides, the aristocrats were pro-tyrannist and Miltiades came of a family long hostile to the tyrannists.) McGregor suggests that Themistocles "had a double motive in gaining Miltiades as his ally: the latter would prove a perfect partner for his foreign policy, while in domestic circles he was well aware of the political prestige to be gained from association with the name Miltiades. The prosecution by the Alkmaionidai was wholly a matter of domestic politics." My own observation (234-5) was: "The picture becomes clear and reasonable as soon as we regard the struggle as primarily domestic . . . Themistocles, a *novus homo*, was glad to be associated with a name . . . To<sup>gether</sup>, these two enemies of Persia, one a democrat and the other a noble turned democrat, might destroy the Alcmaeonidae." McGregor ends the paragrapah by saying that "the whole incident is not entirely a domestic matter, as Robinson claims, for only the Alkmaionidai were influenced by internal politics alone." But I have already noted that in this "primarily

domestic" struggle the actors in the drama included Themistocles and Miltiades, "two enemies of Persia." Just as McGregor maintains (95) that "domestic and foreign affairs could not be entirely divorced," so I too protested (233) against any assumption "that the Athenians could isolate foreign policy from domestic"; incidentally, this does not mean that the Athenians might not agree on a specific foreign issue or that in a domestic struggle there might not be present disloyal, but impotent, elements (such as the aristocrats).

It is not necessary to discuss fully McGregor's brief summary of Athenian politics after Marathon (95), but he holds that "with the foreign threat temporarily checked Themistokles must have abandoned his support of Miltiades and allowed his natural political opponents, the two great families, to fight one another. The disgrace of Miltiades left Themistokles only one hostile party with which to cope. For several years Themistokles stayed at the Athenian helm." My own belief (236-7) is that Themistocles, driven by ambition and realizing that no matter how many enemies he might ostracize he would still be ineligible for re<sup>e</sup>lection to the archonship, set out deliberately to raise the board of ten generals to a position of first importance in the state, thus making possible "one man power." This is why he caused the archonship to be thrown open to the lot, an action which indirectly weakened the Areopagus as well, for ex-archons (now unimportant persons) automatically passed on to the venerable Council. The Athenians, no doubt, would not have followed Themistocles, if they themselves had not been in a mood to attack two institutions which had long been associated with aristocracy; indeed, a quarter of a century later they actually deprived the Council of all its powers except those relating to homicide.

C. A. ROBINSON, JR.

BROWN UNIVERSITY

## REVIEWS

**An Exegetical Grammar of the Greek New Testament.** By WILLIAM DOUGLAS CHAMBERLAIN. xxi, 233 pages. Macmillan, New York 1941. \$4

The professor of New Testament language and literature at the Louisville Presbyterian Seminary has written this book with the intention of offering a helpful, convenient handbook to the seminary student and teacher. The volume, which owes its inspiration to A. T. Robertson's Grammar of the Greek New Testament in the Light of Historical Research (1915), is divided into six parts: I The Principles of Exegesis, II Building a Greek Vocabulary, III The Parts of Speech and Their Functions, IV Clauses, V Sentences, VI Principal Parts of Some Important N. T. Verbs, to which is subjoined an index of the Scripture passages cited in the text.

Chamberlain wishes brevity and clarity to be the characteristic marks of his grammar. Certainly, in reducing Robertson's monumental tome to the slight compass of 213 pages of text, he has succeeded in attaining his first aim. Unfortunately, however, the same degree of success has not attended the author's efforts toward clarity. The text which was used as the basis of the citations from the New Testament should have been indicated. An eclectic text of the N. T. is no firm basis for drawing up rules of grammar (126; 173). Again, the second part (18-9) contains a brief discussion of accentuation which, I fear, will be the Waterloo of students not so fortunate as to have Dr. Chamberlain at their elbows. A reference is made to enclitics, but no explanation is offered as to how many there are or what rules of accentuation are to be followed in their use. On the other hand, the student is told explicitly

that infinitives and participles "follow the rules of noun accent"! A similar lack of clarity is evidenced in the failure to tell how the stems of nouns and verbs, a point mentioned frequently in part three, are to be derived, secondly to explain *ōtov* (167), since only the nominative and accusative of *ōtus* are given in part three, and, finally, to add "poetry" in the statement (183), bolstered by citation from Goodwin, that the future indicative "was occasionally found in classical Greek after *ōπως* to express purpose." Of course, I must in fairness add, the author urges those who use his book to avail themselves of other grammars as well; yet I think that many students would be hopelessly confused by these unclear statements and, considering themselves, as Dr. Chamberlain asserts in his introduction, "not qualified to judge grammars," would throw up their hands in despair.

The actual grammatical explanations follow rather closely Robertson's work, with many references to Moulton's Grammar of New Testament Greek. Here again Chamberlain has done valiant work in reducing those unwieldy volumes to a more modest size. However, I wonder if it would not have been profitable to give the declension of the sacred name *Iησοῦς* and to eliminate the statement (64) that liquid verbs do not add -*σ-* in the aorist? The explanation that verbs beginning with a vowel take the syllabic augment and contract it with the initial vowel is surprising. Furthermore, the interpretation (106) of *iota* in the famous phrase from Phil. 2:6 *τὸ εἶναι iota θεῶν* as a predicate nominative adjective has no grammatical support, as far as I know. Likewise, I would disagree with the author's statements (173; 182) that *ως* with the circumstantial participle expresses 'vi sua' an "alleged reason," that the articular infinitive in Lk. 2:27 should be included under the infinitive of indirect discourse (203), that *θρησκός* in Jas. 1:26 is a noun (203) and that *οὐκοῦν* in Jn. 18:37 indicates that the questioner wants an affirmative answer (208).

The formal exegetical content of the book is not great, since the author prefers to leave that task to the student. He has, however, set down in his introduction a few rules for exegesis, some of which will be approved by all, while others will not meet with universal approbation.

As for the printer's work in setting up the book, the use of capital F for digamma is certainly novel. The proof reader should see that in the next edition *τοί* (161) loses its accent, and that *πράγμα* (12), *ἰδός* (52), and *ἀγγελός* (190) get correct ones, while *βάθος* (12) should be assigned to the third declension and *ἄδωλος* (13) given the neuter termination.

Despite the defects which have been pointed out, the book is a laudable and interesting experiment which indicates the abiding interest Professor Chamberlain has in his chosen field. Such enthusiasm will, un-

doubtedly, lead him to a careful revision of his work with a view to eliminating these minor blots from his second edition, to which we may all look forward with pleasure.

JOHN P. CARROLL

JESUIT NOVITIATE, WERNERSVILLE, PENNSYLVANIA

**Plato.** Selected Passages Chosen and Edited by R. W. LIVINGSTONE. xxiv, 220 pages. Oxford University Press, London 1941 (The World's Classics, CDLXXXVII) \$0.80

One approaches a book of "selected passages"—either in the original language or in translation—with some trepidation, coupled with sympathy, minus prejudice. The trepidation is generated by a hope that no unfortunate selections have been made; the sympathy arises perhaps from an attempt by the reviewer, in some past experience, to make appropriate selections; and the prejudice, which might ensue, must, in all fairness, be curtailed if not wholly suppressed. The chief difficulty in making a book of selected passages has its inception not in the choice of what to include—although that, in itself, is not easy—but even more in a culminating decision touching the portions duly omitted. No two readers will agree; no single reader will find himself wholly satisfied. And when the selection-maker has before him the vast range of the whole Platonic corpus, the task may prove to be of proportions verging on impossibility, since the compiler himself undoubtedly—as in this case—an acknowledged Platonic scholar, knows full well that there are but three alternatives for the understanding and unfolding of the whole Socrates-Plato story, namely, driving through the entire body of the so-called thirty-six dialogues, or pressing down with vigor and thoroughness upon one tetralogy, or treating minutely one tremendous dialogue.

Some years ago Forman of Cornell issued a book of Selections from Plato, which many teachers of Greek found useful. Here were gathered, apparently, the choicest and most significant excerpts from the dialogues—both major and minor—tending to present to the student the character of the "true Socrates" almost in living shape, as if conjured up from the abyss of eternity. But while the selections were doubtless chosen with an infinite care—characteristic of the scholar named—and were concatenated through the book, thanks to a connecting commentary and synopsis, yet American teachers in general found a greater satisfaction in reading with their classes such great treatises in toto as the Phaedo, the Meno, Symposium, Theaetetus or Timaeus.

So in the matter of Selected Passages from Plato in translation. The reviewer questions the adequacy of performance resultant to the chance reader. The latter might be in a position to reap a richer harvest of Socratic-Platonic philosophy, of personal acquaintance

with the interlocutors, chief and subaltern, of desired evaluation of the unique and intriguing style of the great prose-poet, if indeed such can appreciably be acquired through the medium of any translation, by centering his efforts upon one, four or perhaps eight of the greater dialogues, building on the scheme of philosophy therein promulgated and clarified.

However, Sir Richard's book appears to fulfill adequately the purpose for which it was intended: to offer to the layman an opportunity to become acquainted with the best and most useful presentations from the master mind of the greatest of all philosophers. To that end, translations from Jowett's rendering are given, in excerpt, under the following captions: (1) Socrates: beginning with the portraits of the sage from the Symposium, *Apology* and *Phaedrus* and adding the matchless closing scene of the *Phaedo* (2) Spiritual Life; Love: derived principally, as is fitting, from the *Symposium* (3) Religion; drawing upon *Timaeus*, *Laws*, *Phaedo*, and closing, appropriately, with the Prayer to Pan from the *Phaedrus* (4) Politics; Ideals and Realities: mainly from *Laws* and *Republic*, with some pregnant selections from the *Politicus* and *Gorgias*, including the quotation from Euripides' *Antiope* (frag. 20) (5) Education: based largely on *Timaeus*, *Republic* and *Laws* (6) Moral Ideals: from the *Republic* and *Laws* with two short passages from *Crito* and *Apology* (7) Art and Poetry: derived mainly from *Laws* and *Ion* (8) Miscellaneous: from *Laws*, *Meno*, *Crito*, *Gorgias* and *Apology* and (9) Fables and Myths: where we gladly find the rich stories from *Phaedrus*, *Phaedo*, *Gorgias* and, concluding the work most fittingly, the tale of *Er* from the *Republic*.

The introduction is admirable and trenchant, from its opening paragraph to its conclusion.

HERBERT PIERREPONT HOUGHTON

CARLETON COLLEGE

**Das göttliche Kind in mythologischer und psychologischer Beleuchtung.** I, Das Urkind in der Urzeit, by K. KERÉNYI; II, Zur Psychologie des Kind-Archetypus, by C. G. JUNG. 124 pages, 5 plates. Pantheon Akademische Verlagsanstalt (Amsterdam 1940) (Albae Vigiliae, Heft VI-VII) (5.40 M.)

This book presents the combined attack of a classicist and a psychoanalyst on the problem: "How and why can the human mind conceive of a god who is at the same time a weak infant and a mighty power?" Since obviously a classicist cannot presume to criticize the writing of a medical man (83-124), I shall limit myself to the part written by Kerényi (11-82).

Let it be said at the outset that author and reviewer belong, it seems, to two different worlds. In his preface (11-18) the Hungarian scholar establishes his viewpoint, which is—and here he follows his friend Walter

F. Otto<sup>1</sup>—that there exists a sharp cleavage between his method and that of the 'Religionshistoriker', which is best stated by Friedrich Pfister in *Die Religion der Griechen und Römer* (7, 9, 11, 146f., 154f.). For Kerényi all interpretation of a myth is futile. Mythic images have both an objective and a subjective side; on their objective side one can do them justice only by letting them speak for themselves. A 'mythologeme' has sense only in the way in which a musical composition has sense, i.e. appeals to our feelings (13). Since all mythic images or, as Kerényi prefers to style them, 'ideas' emerge from the 'unconscious',<sup>2</sup> their treatment has to be psychological, for "the basic mythical ideas are, so to speak, man's psychic organs"<sup>3</sup> (13). Every attempt to interpret a myth rests satisfied with an 'as if'; the inmost meaning can be only paraphrased, but not described. For Kerényi the mythical 'Urbild' is simply Jung's 'archetype', a term which psychologists, as I am informed, are by no means unanimous in accepting. Mythology requires two methods of investigation: from the side of 'Kulturwissenschaft' and from that of natural science (psychological). Mythic images are 'Seinsbilder', i.e. in them the secrets of reality reveal themselves (15). They are images of an 'Urzeit', which is not a chronological term. But they also have a *telos*, i.e. they are still functioning; they are "vitally necessary elements of the psychic economy" (16). Furthermore, mythical beings are not only 'Urwesen', they are 'Endwesen', i.e. they bring salvation. The divine child occurs not only in stories about the beginning of the Universe, but also in prophecies of a coming better world (17).

This brief exposition of the author's principles of work was necessary to justify my statement of our different viewpoints, between which yawns an unbridgeable chasm. In the body of his book, Kerényi denies first, against Nilsson, that the stories about the childhood of a god have any biographical meaning. "The acts of the child Apollo, of the child Hermes are characteristic of these gods" (21). But they are in reality timeless. The vitality of the divine child is no less than that of the same divinity viewed as a full-grown man. On the contrary, it is richer and more impressive. Here

<sup>1</sup> W. F. Otto, *Dionysos, Mythos und Kultus* (1933). I agree in every respect with Rose's review in *JHS* 1934.100. It is perhaps significant that German and Italian reviewers take the opposite standpoint.

<sup>2</sup> Here he returns to the conception of the brothers Grimm; cf. O. Gruppe, *Geschichte der Mythologie* (1921) 155f. and his words (158) which apply to K.'s method. See ib. on K.'s use of the word 'Symbol'.

<sup>3</sup> Does this mean anything more than that man could not conceive an abstract form? K. might have profited from the remarks of E. Cassirer, *Philosophie der symbolischen Formen* II 218, 233. The intuitional point of view seems to gain currency in Germany. Cf. *Psychological Abstracts* XV (1941) 2063: Intuition is the common pre-form of all conscious perception, the basis of speech, symbols, myths.

we have that 'Urelement' of the mythical tale, where the most miraculous figments grow and thrive (23). This divine child is a veritable 'filius ante patrem' (24).

To prove this contention Kerényi enumerates the typical features of the tale. The divine child, he says, is always an orphan or a deserted foundling.<sup>4</sup> He experiences many perils, but escapes them all through his own power and effort. Most peculiar is the fact that the mother "is and is not at once" (Tages, Dionysos, Asklepios, even Zeus). The stories about the child's animal and human nurses express the solitariness of the child and also the fact that he is at home in the 'Ur-welt'. Kerényi recognizes the truth that we are here in the sphere of the Märchen (26). But he emphasizes (27-32) his view that we must not assume a priority of this sphere, from which a transfer has been made to the world of the myth.<sup>5</sup>

Starting from myths told by the Mongolian tribe of the Woguls, by the Finns (Kullervo) and by the Hindoos (Markandeya episode of the Mahabharata), our author proceeds to the discussion of Apollo, Hermes, Zeus and Dionysos. Over and over again he stresses the features mentioned in his introductory chapter, in order to establish his main thesis: childhood and adventures of the divine child have grown out of the 'Materie des Weltlebens'. They are so to speak "an anecdote which the world tells from its own biography". I confess that the meaning of this assertion escapes me completely. To allegorize the myths, he continues, as similes of nature phenomena would deprive them of their vitalizing core, a timeless 'Weltgehalt' . . . "A mythologeme speaks, acts, has value per se, like a scientific theory or a musical composition, like any genuine work of art" (51-2). In spite of this rejection of nature symbolism, Kerényi yet assumes an elemental water as a mythical image (ib.) and sees such also in the dolphin, on the basis of a disputed etymology,<sup>6</sup> and in the rocks of the earth (59). The discussion of Hermes leads him into the thorny question of the original bisexuality of all divine beings (62) and into a discussion of what he terms the original 'musicality of the universe' (68).

In the chapter about Zeus he joins issue particularly with Nilsson's penetrating treatment of the Zeus child. He rejects that scholar's thesis of a later transfer of a Cretan tale to the Hellenic sky-god.<sup>7</sup> Last he treats

<sup>4</sup> But Zeus can be called neither an orphan nor a foundling. His mother gives him to a kindly relative for safeguarding. And while Dionysos is an orphan, he also is placed in the hands of kindly friends. Here I see a sharp difference from such figures as Kullervo, of whom K. makes so much.

<sup>5</sup> See H. J. Rose, *Modern Methods in Classical Mythology* (1930) 23.

<sup>6</sup> Boisacq, *Dictionnaire Étymologique* s.v.

<sup>7</sup> Minoan-Mycenaean Religion 461-513. The parallels adduced by K. from Italian soil (74-76) have failed to convince me.

of Dionysos, chiefly in dependence on W. F. Otto's book (above, n. 1). This god is for him also bisexual (80).

This all too summary résumé will make it clear why I said that Kerényi and myself live in two different worlds. In that respect, the closing words of the essay are very characteristic: "Are we speaking of the orphan child of the Märchen or, from the beginning, of the mutilated Dionysos child? Are we dealing with a primitive dream, with ancient religion, or with an 'Urphilosophie'? . . . That shall remain unclear and undecided. For this was our topic: the Ur-untchiedene, the Urkind." I gladly own that these words remain unintelligible to me. It is to be regretted that this obfuscating mysticism, which seems to sweep over Central-European religious research like a total eclipse, perhaps an inevitable reaction to the uprooting experience of the scholars during the last 25 years, is vitiating the efforts of men who gave promise of becoming true investigators. In spite of all this verbiage, we others still long for the serenity of the Greek sky under which the outlines appear clearly and sharply defined.

ERNST RIESS

SCARSDALE, NEW YORK

**Manetho.** With an English Translation by W. G. WADDELL. xxxii, 256 pages, 4 plates, map. **Ptolemy, Tetrabiblos.** Edited and Translated into English by F. E. ROBBINS. xxiv, 466 pages. Heinemann, London and Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1940 (Loeb Classical Library, No. 350) \$2.50

We have here to deal with a composite volume, containing two distinct works, with separate title-pages and pagination, published together, I suppose, simply because both authors were born in Egypt, though centuries apart and of widely differing races and cultures.

In the first part Professor Waddell, of the Fuad el Awal University in Cairo, edits the fragments of the Egyptian priest, Manetho of Sebennytus, who flourished under Ptolemy II Philadelphus and wrote extensively of his country's history and religion. This is the first edition of the text to appear since Müller's *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum* (1848), and with it the first translation into English, a point not pressed by the modest editor. Manetho's importance is due largely to the fact that, though decipherment of monuments has corrected his work in some details, his pioneer classification of the Egyptian kings into thirty dynasties is still substantially sound. The existence of a complete English version of the fragments will be a great boon to the growing number of writers on ancient history who are innocent of either Greek or Latin. For them Waddell has gone to the trouble of noting variants, not only in the apparatus, but also in the translation.

Of the eighty-eight genuine fragments (there are

four appendices with the spurious), seventy-five are drawn from the Aegyptiaca (or its epitome), the rest from the other works of Manetho. Since they are preserved by Josephus, Plutarch, Africanus, Eusebius and a number of later writers, Waddell thus translates necessarily from both Latin and Greek, and the Armenian version of Eusebius has been consulted for him by the late Professor Margoliouth. To translate these fragments presents no serious difficulties, save for the tedium of transliterating the frequent numerals into Arabic. A careful search has failed to detect a single error in the length of reigns. In transcribing Otto's edition of Theophilus ad Autolycum 3.20, Waddell has inserted Arabic numerals into the text where, to be consistent with his practice elsewhere, he should have used Greek numerals in triangular brackets, and the reference to this passage given in the text (3.20) is inconsistent with that of the translation (3.19). He translates *ēkdoos* by both 'edition' (36) and 'recension' (38), though the sense is precisely the same in both cases. The force of the perfect in *πεπιστεύκασι* (194) is lost in the translation, and in Appendix III (The Old Chronicle, page 228) a number of connectives (*πρὸς οἷς, μεθ' οὖς, etc.*) have been neglected, though without marring the sense. I note one wrong accent (*ἐνιαυτὸν* for *ἐνιαυτόν*, 108), and one infelicitous phrase: "... dated by Gutschmid to the end of the second century..." (226 n.). Otherwise the translation seems perfect.

The commentary is, for the Loeb Library, unusually full, with frequent references to Meyer's *Geschichte des Altertums*, of which the chronology is followed, and to Baedeker and other useful literature. Some readers may regret that the dates of the reigns are not indicated in the headings or margins, but that Waddell has been wise in omitting them is shown by the detriment to Biblical scholarship caused by the printing of Archbishop Ussher's chronology in the heading of many editions of the Bible. The introduction leans heavily on Laqueur's article on Manetho (PWK 27.1060-1106). The index seems to be complete, though the map does not contain all the places mentioned. The plates illustrate three scarabs, the Palermo Stone, the Baden Papyrus 4.59, and three coins with representations of Serapis. All in all, this edition is extremely well done, and we could ask for nothing better on Manetho, except for a complete edition of his text based on a papyrus as yet undiscovered.

Having said this, it is perhaps unreasonable to ask for still more, but specialists in ancient history will wish that the editors had seen fit to include a companion edition of the fragments of Berossus, the Chaldaean priest whose work so completely parallels Manetho's that some writers, e.g. Havet and other Frenchmen, have believed that the two were merely the fictitious creation of later writers. In any case, the fragments of

Berossus would have added, on the same scale, only about forty pages of text and translation.

In their place we have the so-called Tetrabiblos or Quadripartitum of Claudius Ptolemaeus, really the celebrated astronomer's treatise on astrology. The reader devoid of interest in astrology and astronomy, which to Ptolemaeus were one and the same thing, will find the Tetrabiblos very dull save in spots. To be recommended, however, are chapters 2-3 of Book II, dealing with astrological influence upon the characteristics of the inhabitants of the general climes and of the different countries; chapter 13 of Book III, on the quality of the soul, in which Ptolemaeus lists well-nigh every adjective that can be applied to human personality; and chapters 5-9 of Book IV which deal, respectively, with marriage, children, friends and enemies, foreign travel, and the quality of death.

Nevertheless, this edition is doubly welcome because it is the first to appear since Junctinus' edition of 1581, while the translation has been preceded in English only by the very bad version of John Whalley (1701, reprinted without improvement in 1786). In preparing his text Robbins has unfortunately been prevented by the present circumstances in Europe from seeing any of the thirty-five extant MSS of the Tetrabiblos, the earliest of which dates only from the thirteenth century. Instead he has worked from a collection of photographs or photostats of eleven of the more important MSS, gathered together by an unnamed German scholar, and of the tenth-century Vatican MS of the Paraphrase attributed usually to Proclus. He has also utilized the editions of Camerarius (princeps, Nürnberg 1535, Basel 1553), and many of the translations into Latin and other tongues, the existence of which is an eloquent testimony of the interest other ages showed in astrology. With these he has been able to constitute a workable text. The reading *θηγαέρων ἀδελφαῖς* [Tetrabiblos 4.5 (187), page 402] makes nonsense and disturbs the remarkable balance of the context. I suggest the emendation *ἀδελφῶν θηγατράσι* which preserves the balance and makes sense.<sup>1</sup> The reading *τε* is attributed to two MSS in the note to the translation (233), whereas the apparatus lists three (VPD).

Not only is the matter of the Tetrabiblos extremely difficult to comprehend, even by experts in astrology, a fact to which testify a lost commentary by Pancharios, an anonymous commentary (perhaps by Proclus), an introduction to which the name of Porphyry has been attached, and the elaborate commentary of Hieronymus Cardanus (Basel 1554, 1579; Leyden 1555, 1663), but

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the critical note on *νιόντος ἀδελφῶν*, three lines higher on the page, which is the reading of VMDE, whereas PLM and Camerarius' editions have *νιόντων ἀδελφοῖς*. It is surprising that Robbins has found no variants in the MSS for the later passage.

the Greek in which it is written is so unnecessarily complicated that at times it is almost impossible to translate. Thus, Robbins' readable English version is an achievement worthy of the highest praise. Yet occasionally comparison of the translation with the text is impeded by reversal of word order. For example, "In somewhat summary fashion," etc. (20) appears fourteen lines higher on the page than the corresponding Greek words. A desire for variety, more virtuous in English than in Greek, has sometimes led to rendering the same Greek word, used in exactly the same sense, by different English words. Cf. *κοινωνικός*—'helpful' (135), 'co-operative' (137 with wrong accent) and 'social' (137-9, 151-3); *ἡρέμα*—'in a less degree,' 'to a less degree,' and 'in some degree' on the same page (51). For 'Orchinia' (143), I should read 'Orchenia' ('Ορχηνία'); for 'birds' (263), 'fowls' (the context is clear); for 'males' and 'females' (325), 'men' and 'women' (there is point to the distinction); for 'lichens' (326-8, 432), 'mentagra' (since the disease, not the plant, is meant), while 'publicans' (387) has a connotation for English readers not found in *τελώνες*. Two technical terms, superparticular (73-5) and exaltation (89), are missing from the index.

Before concluding we should note that with the 350th volume the Loeb Classical Library has added two new editors to its staff. L. A. Post has long been known for his work on Menander and Plato, while E. H. Warmington is an expert in ancient geography and has more recently won recognition for his four-volume *Remains of Old Latin* in the Loeb Classical Library itself. The reputation of these men thus assures the future of the series.

GEORGE McCracken

OTTERBEIN COLLEGE

### Der Peripatos über das Greisenalter. By ADOLF DYROFF.

137 pages. Schöningh, Paderborn 1939  
(*Studien zur Geschichte und Kultur des Altertums*, 21.3) 6.80 M.

During the two decades following 1918 the youth of Germany prostrate in defeat experienced various "crises," often manifesting themselves in a critical regard of old age, as was evident from serious debates and literary discussions, newspaper caricatures, and notably the pointed treatment of the father-son problem on the stage. The veteran philosopher of Bonn University, who dedicates the present inquiry "Seinen vielen noch rüstig schaffenden Altersgenossen, ein Dreundsiebzigjähriger," tells of this post-war attitude in his foreword (9-14). Deeming it preferable not to consider the phenomenon as a contemporary problem but in the light of a broader human experience, he states that Christianity can with playful ease solve all difficulties involved. However, he adds, if we choose to

regard human concerns without the benefit of the light shed by Christianity, we must consult above all life as it was lived by pre-Christian peoples; and the problem of old age in antiquity is one that deserves a thorough investigation employing the best modern means of research.

For the present, then, the author proposes to turn to the two ancient peoples credited with the classical pattern of living. He further limits himself to a study of Aristotle and his school as the first serious investigators of the relative values of the human *aetates*.

Old age does not fare well at all in Aristotle's most detailed discussion of it, *Rhetorica* 2.12-4 (Ch. I: 15-34). However, it should be noted that in this instance the Stagirite follows a penchant to emphasize undesirable opposites, as he does in establishing the acceptable mean in ethical virtues; and here he over-charges two extremes, youth and old age—especially the latter—when setting up the *μεταξὺ τούτων*, manhood, as an ideal. Moreover, it is well to recall that the idea of an Aristotelian *Gesamtausgabe* of the *Rhetorica* has been badly shattered: Usener asserted that *Rhet.* 3 could not have been published before 45 B.C.; and, combining theories successfully advanced by Fr. Marx and Werner Jaeger, it appears that the present invective against old age achieved Aristotelian canonicity only ca. 200-48. Dyroff, though, thinks 21f.) it quite possible that Aristotle's indictment of old age was sponsored by the aging Isocrates, whose quarrel with Plato is well known. In such case Aristotle, who had joined opposition to the rhetores when he was still very young, defended his teacher against Isocrates' querulousness, manifesting itself even then, ca. 360. The theory of early composition is also supported by a consideration (22-34) of the scattered, more favorable utterances on old age in the later writings of the philosopher: evidently he had learned to base his judgment more on actual observation and less a priori on contrasts presented by succeeding generations of men.

Under the Roman name of Juncus considerable fragments of a dialogue *Περὶ γῆρας* have been preserved by the anthologist Stobaeus: 5.1026-31, 1049-53, 1060-5, 1107-9 Hense. Three decades ago J. A. A. Faltin endeavored to show that the language of these fragments is pronouncedly Atticistic, wherefore Juncus has been assigned to the second century of the Christian era (cf. Kroll, Pauly-Wissowa-Kroll 19.953f.). While Faltin observed the great abundance of Platonic vocabulary, Dyroff more recently (RhM N. F. 86 [1937] 241-69) called attention to the preponderance of Peripatetic thought and its close kinship to what is known of Ariston of Julis on the island of Ceos.

Anticipating the results of his continued studies, in this book relegated to an appendix, the author identifies Juncus with Ariston and thus arrives at a third-century intermediary between Aristotle and Cicero (Ch. II:

35-45). He is convinced that the unnamed authority approached by the disputants of the Ariston-Juncus dialogue is none other than Tithonus; for Ariston wrote a dialogue on old age entitled *Tithonus* and Cicero's *De Senectute* both seems to imply the Aristonic *Tithonus* as its model and contains much in common with the so-called Juncus-fragments. Regarding the attitude taken toward old age, it is much more favorable in these pieces than in the Aristotelian *Rhetorica*.

Chapter III (46-79) contains a detailed study of Cicero's *Cato Maior de Senectute* and its Peripatetic complexion. The cases of accord between the dialogues of Cicero and "Juncus" are numerous, even to the inclusion of otherwise insignificant details. Yet, the former constantly tends to escape from or at least to abbreviate what the latter offers in greater detail. The inference is obvious: the Roman cannot possibly have served as the literary ancestor of the writer of the Stobaean excerpts; rather, Cicero's primary pattern was the same as that of "Juncus." It is further shown that the *De Senectute*, for all its originality, also contains a considerable number of reminiscences of Aristotle, Theophrastus, and other Peripatetic sources. Whether Cicero owed this additional material to that portion of the Ariston-Juncus dialogue which has been lost, or whether subsidiary sources were used, the author does not venture to decide.

In the Appendix (80-137), finally, Dyroff offers a very painstaking philological analysis of the so-called Juncus-fragments to show conclusively that their author and Ariston of Julis are one and the same person. He demonstrates against Faltin that it is not true that these fragments are distinguished by a prevailing Atticism. Except for a number of Platonic and Peripatetic words and phrases, the language quite certainly belongs to the koiné. To the reviewer the agreement of prepositional usage with that of Polybius is particularly striking (92-5). A comparison of the vocabulary and figures of speech found in the few surviving fragments of Ariston with those in the fragments under discussion also speaks for an identical authorship. The diction of

"Juncus" confirms Cicero's judgment on Ariston of Julis (Fin. 5.13): *concinus et elegans . . . sed ea quae desideratur a magno philosopho gravitas in eo non est.*

It remains for the author to suggest (136f.) that the Stobaean riddle *ΙΟΥΝΚΟΥ ἐκ τοῦ Περὶ γῆρας* is only a palaeographical corruption of *ΙΟΥΛΙΝΤΟΥ* ( $\Lambda > N$ ) κτλ. Because there are so many Greek writers with the name "Ioannes," we have become accustomed to use only the regional cognomen "Stobaeus": similarly, to prevent confusing Ariston of Ceos with a host of namesakes (e. g., the Stoic Ariston of Chios, the Peripatetic Ariston of Cos, etc.), the *Ἀρίστων* of *Ἀρίστωνος Ιουλίντου* was perhaps dropped before or during Stobaeus' time. The limitations of space preclude recording further considerations made by the author.

In this monograph, then, a septuagenarian thinker convincingly (and quite consciously!) demonstrates that he is still very much in his *akmé* in the best sense of Aristotle; and classical scholarship is indebted for an inspiring contribution. Minor notanda are these: With a completely new solution of the Juncus-problem the dominating theme of the book, as much might have been intimated in the title; e. g., "Der Peripatos, zumal Junkos (=Ariston), über das Greisenalter." Attempting to establish that some sixty lines of "Juncus" (1062.5-1065.10 Hense) are actually borrowed from Theophrastus, the author finds (105) only one word that seemingly is not pre-koiné: *μονοροχί* (1062.19). Polybius 3.102.4, he remarks, offers a first resemblance: *μόνον οὐ*. For his comfort be it recorded that Demosthenes writes *μόνον οὐχί* twice: Ol. 1.2 and 3.17. Improper Greek accentuation accounts for most of the score or so of misprints noted; particularly enclitic accents received by proparoxytones or properispomena appear to have occasioned some confusion: correct 27 *κατάψυξις τις*, 30 *γῆρας ἔστι*, 94.2 and 119 *ἡττον* *τις*, 119 *δοκούντα σοι*.

J. C. PLUMPE

CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA

#### ABSTRACTS OF ARTICLES

This department is conducted by Dr. Charles T. Murphy of Princeton University, Princeton, New Jersey. Correspondence concerning abstracts may be addressed to him.

For microprint or photoprint copies of articles abstracted send 1c per page for microprint, or 10c per page for photoprint, plus a service charge of 20c for each item, to Bibliofilm Service, Department of Agriculture Library, Washington, D. C. The Service reserves the right to except material readily available elsewhere.

#### ANCIENT AUTHORS

**Homer.** FREDERICK M. COMBELLACK. *Achilles and his Sword.* A defense of *σχέθε χεῖπα* in Iliad I 219 and of its interpretation as "placed in hand." (Sutherland) CPh 36 (1941) 60-3

**Horace.** VAN JOHNSON. *Ninnius, Vinius, and Onysius.* The name *Vinius* in the epistle (1.13.2) of

Horace is most probably a manuscript corruption of *hinne*. CPh 35 (1940) 420-2 (Sutherland)

**Livius Andronicus.** W. BEARE. *When did Livius Andronicus Come to Rome?* It is concluded, from an attempt to reconcile the scanty and conflicting evidence available for the life of Andronicus, that he came to Rome from his native Tarentum in 240 B.C. not as a captive of war or as a slave at all, but as a Greek actor to supervise the first drama to be given in Rome. This was presumably staged to celebrate the recent peace, and Andronicus translated and acted in the play. The Livii were his patrons, and he may have acted as tutor to the son of the first Livius Salinator—thus giving rise to Jerome's statement that he was a slave. CQ 34 (1940) 11-9 (W. Wallace)

**Lucan.** BERTHE M. MARTI. *Three New Glosses from Vacca's Commentary on Lucan.* Found in the unpublished Commentary on the Pharsalia of Arnulfus. Text given.

CPh 36 (1941) 64-5

(Sutherland)

**Tacitus.** G. B. A. FLETCHER. *Assonances or Plays on Words in Tacitus.* Examples in Tacitus similar to Hist. 1.13.3 deposuerat . . . seposit . . ., where Andresen raised the question whether there was an intentional play on words. In a footnote Fletcher lists a number of misprints, wrongly claimed conjectures, and other mistakes in Koestermann's recent Teubner edition.

CR 54 (1940) 184-7

(F. Jones)

**Theocritus.** A. S. F. GOW. *Philology in Theocritus.* In the three passages discussed here (2.155; 18.47; 18.43) Theocritus is displaying his learning to an audience fond of such matters. *Δωρίδα* in the first passage and *Δωριστή* in the second point to rare Dorian usages. In the third he is distinguishing the Greek trefoil (*χαυκής αὐξομένος*) from the Egyptian water-lily which was also more naturally called *λωτός*.

CQ 34 (1940) 113-6

(W. Wallace)

— — — *The Seventh Idyll of Theocritus.* Notes on this famous Idyll describing a literary contest, including a discussion of the names Simichidas, Sikelides, etc., which stand for Theocritus himself and other poets of the time. The rustic Lykidas is probably meant to be a true rustic and not a masquerader, although G. admits there is a difficulty, and offers as a possibility the name of Lycophron, whose father, or perhaps adopted father, was Lykos, called *ὁ Βούθηπας*.

CQ 34 (1940) 47-54

(W. Wallace)

— — — *Theocritus Id. VII.* A further note on the time of year in which the festival was taking place—August seems more likely than July (see CQ 34 [1940] 47-54).

CQ 34 (1940) 117

(W. Wallace)

— CLYDE MURLEY. *Theocritus XXV.* 276-77. The lion was most likely skinned with his own claws, not with the fingernails of Heracles.

CPh 36 (1941) 65-6

(Sutherland)

**Thucydides.** N. G. L. HAMMOND. *The Composition of Thucydides' History.* A brief review of the hundred years of controversy on the subject, maintaining in particular that, *pace* Grundy, Book I shows careful structural unity (this contention is supported by elaborate analysis) and that it was probably the first book of a history of the Archidamian War published before 415 B.C. The arguments by which Grundy and others have tried to show that Thucydides' account in Book I of the cause of the Peloponnesian War must have been written after 413 are answered, and it is argued that only one or two brief passages in the book belong to a post-415 revision.

CQ 34 (1940) 146-52

(W. Wallace)

#### ART. ARCHAEOLOGY

BAUR, P. V. C. *Megarian Bowls in the Rebecca Dartington Stoddard Collection of Greek and Italian Vases in Yale University.* Detailed description of fourteen "Megarian" bowls, of the third and second centuries B.C. together with a Roman pyxis of the second century A.D. and two Hellenistic bowls which are not moulded but resemble the Megarian type in shape. The technique of manufacturing this ware is discussed. III.

AJA 45 (1941) 229-48

(Walton)

DUELL, PRENTICE. *Etruscan Wall Paintings from Fifth-Century Tombs at Tarquinia, Italy.* Notice of an exhibition of watercolors and photographs.

AJA 45 (1941) 164

(Walton)

HAUSER, WALTER. *Discovery of Sasanian Mosaics at Shāpūr.* Notice of the discovery, by a French expedition under Ghirshman, of an important mosaic from the palace of Shāpūr I.

AJA 45 (1941) 165

(Walton)

PERSSON, AXEL W. *Legende und Mythos in ihrem Verhältnis zu Bild und Gleichnis im vorgeschichtlichen Griechenland.* A stone seal from Dendra which shows a lion devouring a bull is thought to symbolize Mycenae overthrowing Crete. Much evidence from Egypt and the Orient and citations of Homer establish the prevalence of these animals in the heraldry of the period, and Hercules's lion skin and various animals involved in his labors are interpreted as heraldic devices. A glass ornament from Dendra representing a woman carried by a bull suggests an interpretation of the Pasiphaë and Europa myths in association with the symbolic bull in Crete, Egypt and the Orient. Ill.

ΔΡΑΓΜΑ 378-401

(Salyer)

YOUNG, JOHN HOWARD. *Studies in South Attica: The Salaminioi at Porthmos; the Property at Porthmos.* Further study of the locality mentioned in the inscriptions discussed by Ferguson (with a note by Thompson) in *Hesperia* 7 (1938) 1ff. "Porthmos" is located at Boundazéza, where the distance from the mainland to the island of Makronísi (the ancient Helene) is shortest. A new site for "Hale" is suggested. A catalogue is appended of "objects from Sounion which may be connected with the Salaminioi and their property." Ill.

Hesperia 10 (1941) 163-91

(Durham)

#### LINGUISTICS. GRAMMAR. METRICS

BONFANTE, G. *The Name of the Phoenicians.* Both the formation and the stem of *Φοινίκη* are Proto-Illyrian.

CPh 36 (1941) 1-20

(Sutherland)

LORIMER, W. L. *AYTAPXIA.* The word *ἀγταρχία* is omitted from the new edition of Liddell and Scott.

CR 54 (1940) 187

(F. Jones)

WINTER, J. G. *Another instance of ὁρθοποδεῖν.* The King James Version translates the verb (Gal. 2.14) as "walk uprightly", but C. H. Roberts recently suggested, on the basis of a papyrus letter, the sense "advance, make progress". This interpretation, which is also indicated by the Latin versions of the passage in Galatians, is supported by the use of the verb in an unpublished letter in the Michigan collection of papyri.

HThR 34 (1941) 161-2

(Walton)

#### HISTORY. SOCIAL STUDIES

MOORHOUSE, A. C. *The Name of the Euxine Pontus.* The Black Sea was originally called *ἄξενος πόντος*, the inhospitable way, probably by Phrygians migrating from Thrace to Asia Minor. Two passages in Herodotus suggest further that the Propontis was originally called *Πόντος*, or the 'way', more favorable than the inhospitable Black Sea.

CQ 34 (1940) 123-8

(W. Wallace)

PAPPANO, ALBERT EARL. *Agrippa Postumus.* Account of his life and death, with reexamination of the available evidence. There is nothing to show positively he was insane, and it is rather probable that he was not.

CPh 36 (1941) 30-45

(Sutherland)

## RECENT PUBLICATIONS

Compiled by Lionel Casson and Bluma L. Trell from the American, British, French and German weekly, and Italian monthly, bibliographical publications, and from books received at the editorial offices. Prices have not been confirmed.

## HISTORY. SOCIAL STUDIES

BURCKHARDT, JACOB. Griechische Kulturgeschichte. Mit e. Nachw. zusammengefasst hrsg. v. Rudolf Marx. Bd 1: Der Staat u. d. Religion. vi, 550 pages, ill. Kröner, Stuttgart 1939 (Kröners Taschenausgabe, Bd 58) 4 M.

GRANDJEAN, GEORGES. La destruction de Jérusalem. 224 pages. Baudinière, Paris 1940 15 fr.

JONES, TOM B. A Short History of Ancient Civilization. xiii, 378 pages, 16 plates, 18 maps. Harper and Brothers, New York 1941 \$2.25

LOENEN, D. Protagoras and the Greek Community. viii, 129 pages. Noord-Hollandsche U. M., Amsterdam 1941 4.50 fl.

Mededelingen van het Nederlandsch historisch instituut te Rome. Uitgegeven vanwege het Departement van onderwijs, kunsten en wetenschappen. 2e reeks. Dl. 9. xxx, 249 pages. Nijhoff, The Hague 1940 5 fl.

MILLER, HUGH. Christian Truth in History. 253 pages. Harper, New York 1941 \$2.50

MOUSSET, G. Histoire ancienne. Orient, Grèce, Rome. viii, 151 pages, ill., 15 maps. Dunod, Paris 1940 22 fr.

OESTERLEY, WILLIAM O. E. The Jews and Judaism during the Greek Period: the background of Christianity. 318 pages. S.P.C.K., London 1941 10s. 6 d.

REHM, ALBERT. Milesische Chronologie von Sulla bis Tiberius. 44 pages. Beck, Munich 1939 (Sitzungsberichte d. Bayer. Akad. d. Wissenschaften, Phil-hist. Abt. Jg 1939 H. 8) 3 M.

ROEBUCK, CARL ANGUS. A History of Messenia from 369 to 146 B.C. iii, 128 pages, map. University of Chicago Libraries, Chicago 1941

Roos, ANTOON GERARD. Comitia tributa. Concilium plebis. Leges. Plebiscita. 44 pages. Noord-Hollandsche U.M., Amsterdam 1940 (Mededelingen d. Koninklijke Nederlandse Akad. v. Wetenschappen, Afd. Letrkunde. N. R. Deel 3, No. 6) 0.80 fl.

SCHINDLER, PETER. Über die Staatlichkeit der Römer. 79 pages. Schöningh, Paderborn 1940 2 M.

SHAH, T. L. Ancient India. A History of Ancient India for 1000 years (900 B.C.—100 A.D.) Vol. 4. Probstain, London 1941 17s. 6d.

STARR, CHESTER G., JR. The Roman Imperial Navy. 31 B.C.—A.D. 324. xv, 228 pages, map. Cornell University Press, Ithaca 1941 (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, Volume XXVI) \$2.50

STEPHAN, REINHOLD. Zur Geschichte des Rauchwarenhandels im Altertum und Mittelalter und die Erschließung des russisch-asiatischen Raumes vom 16-18 Jahrhundert. x, 135 pages. Pöppinghaus, Bochum-Langendreer 1940 (Dissertation)

University of Pennsylvania Bicentennial Conference. Studies in Civilization. vi, 200 pages. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia 1941 \$2

University of Pennsylvania Bicentennial Conference. Studies in the History of Science. 123 pages, ill. University of Pennsylvania Press, Philadelphia 1941 \$1.50

VOESENKEIN, HERMANN. Rome, translated from the German by MOSES HADAS. xiii, 421 pages, 15 plates. Jewish Publication Society of America, Philadelphia 1940 \$2.25

WAIS, GERHARD JULIUS. Die Alamannen in ihrer Auseinandersetzung mit der römischen Welt. Untersuchungen zur german. Landnahme. 247 pages. Ahnenbe-Stiftg Verlag, Berlin-Dahlem 1940 (Dissertation)

## PHILOSOPHY. RELIGION. MYTHOLOGY

BIELOHLAWEK, KARL. Hypothese und Gnome. Untersuchungen über d. griech. Weisheitsdichtung d. vorhellenist. Zeit. 83 pages. Dieterich, Leipzig 1940 (Philologus, Suppl. Bd 32, H. 3) 6 M.

BOLKESTEIN, H. De houding van den Romeinschen staat tegenover nieuwe en uitheemsche godsdiensten in den tijd der republiek. 32 pages. Noord-Hollandsche U. M., Amsterdam 1941 (Mededeelingen der Ned. akademie van wetenschappen, afd. letterkunde. Nieuwe reeks. Dl. 4, No. 2) 0.60 fl.

FOSTER, M. B. Masters of Political Thought. Vol. 1. Plato to Machiavelli. 311 pages. Houghton, Boston 1941 \$2.25

GILSON, ÉTIENNE HENRY. God and Philosophy. 165 pages. Yale University Press, New Haven 1941 (Powell lectures on philosophy at Indiana University, 5th series) \$2

GUERBER, H. A. De mythen van Griekenland en Rome. xi, 402 pages. W. J. Thieme, Zutphen 1940 3.90 fl.

HERMANSEN, GUSTAV. Studien über den italischen und den römischen Mars. Von Fritz Glöde übers. 191 pages. Gyldendal, Copenhagen 1940 (Dissertation) (13 M.)

LOENEN, D. See above under HISTORY. SOCIAL STUDIES.

NESTLE, WILHELM. Vom Mythos zum Logos. Die Selbstentfaltung des griechischen Denkens von Homer bis auf die Sophistik und Socrates. viii, 572 pages. Kröner, Stuttgart 1940 15 M.

NILSSON, MARTIN P. Geschichte der griechischen Religion. I. Band. Bis zur griechischen Weltherrschaft. xxiv, 823 pages, 52 plates, 8 figures in text. Beck, Munich 1941 (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, V 2) 45 M.

TUIN, DE. Der geden. Mythen der Egyptenaren, volken van Voor-Azië, Indiërs, Grieken, Scandinaviërs en Kelten. Onder redactie van A. G. van Hamel. xvi, 407 pages. W. de Haan, Utrecht 1940 5.90 fl.

VAN VEEN, J. S. Beknopt overzicht der Griekse mythologie. 80 pages. Wolters, Groningen 1940 0.80 fl.

## ART. ARCHAEOLOGY

Fondation Eugène Piot. Monuments et Mémoires, T. 37. 148 pages, ill., 11 plates. Presses universitaires de France, Paris 1940 200 fr.

GINSBURG, MICHAEL. Hunting Scenes on Roman Glass in the Rhineland. 31 pages, 12 figures. University of Nebraska, Lincoln 1941 (Studies in the Humanities, No. 1=University of Nebraska Studies, Volume 41, No. 2) \$0.75

Metropolitan Museum of Art. The Daily Life of the Greeks and Romans as illustrated in the collections by HELEN McCLEES with additions by C. ALEXANDER. 6th edition, with corrections. xviii, 143 pages, 162+30 figures. Metropolitan Museum of Art, New York 1941 \$1

PFISTER, R. Textiles de Palmyre. 100 pages, ill., 19 plates. Les éditions d'art et d'histoire, Paris 1940 80 fr.

WHITE, ANNE TERRY. Lost Worlds: Adventures in Archaeology. 316 pages, ill. Random House, New York 1941 \$2.50

"For boys and girls 12-16."